

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/792,048	03/03/2004	Robert J. Smith	FSI-1	4756	
21833 75	90 10/20/2005		EXAMINER		
PRITZKAU PATENT GROUP, LLC			NGUYEN, HUNG T		
993 GAPTER R BOULDER, CO			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
<b>,</b>			2636		
			DATE MAILED: 10/20/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				( )		
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/792,048	SMITH, ROBERT J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		HUNG T. NGUYEN	2636			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	•		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISION of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communical			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/3/0-	<u>4 &amp; 9/26/05</u> .				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>42-70</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>42-53 and 68-70</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>54-67</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10)⊠ <sup>-</sup>	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 March 2004</u> is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the case Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[/ a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign    All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment	(s)					
I) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2636

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 42, 47 & 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Bonte et al. (U.S. 5,931,233).

Regarding claim 42, La Bonte discloses a method for detecting a presence of wildfire (106) by photoelectric detection, smoke (190), thermal (188) or infrared sensors (185,192) [ figs.1-5, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and col.21, lines 34-65 ] comprising:

- at least 2 phases of operations can be used if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ fig.1, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and abstract ];
- phase 1, chemical treated water is provided to produce a cool fog dispersion pattern, the structure (102) being protected by a jet nozzles (130) [ figs.2-3, ,5, col.5, line 53 to col.6, line 34, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 ];

Art Unit: 2636

- phase 2, water soaking the surface of the structure (102) continuous as the flames pass through the area surrounding the structure (102) being protected by a jet nozzles (136) [ col.11, lines 18-26, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 ].

Although, the reference of La Bonte does not specifically mention wavelength, first and second ratios of oxygen compounds as claimed by the applicant.

However, the reference of La Bonte clearly teaches at least 2 phases of operations can be used to maximum protect the building structure (102) which is set up or programmed the system (100) if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ figs.2-3, ,5, col.5, line 53 to col.6, line 34, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 and abstract ].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to utilize the system of La Bonte for monitoring and controlling the wildfire at all time near or close to the building structure.

Regarding claim 47, La Bonte discloses an apparatus for detecting a presence of wildfire (106) by photoelectric detection, smoke (190), thermal (188) or infrared sensors (185,192) [ figs.1-5, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and col.21, lines 34-65 ] comprising:

- at least 2 phases of operations can be used if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ fig.1, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and abstract ];

- phase 1, chemical treated water is provided to produce a cool fog dispersion pattern, the structure (102) being protected by a jet nozzles (130) [ figs.2-3, ,5, col.5, line 53 to col.6, line 34, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 ];
- phase 2, water soaking the surface of the structure (102) continuous as the flames pass through the area surrounding the structure (102) being protected by a jet nozzles (136) [ col.11, lines 18-26, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 ].

Although, the reference of La Bonte does not specifically mention wavelength, first and second ratios of oxygen compounds as claimed by the applicant.

However, the reference of La Bonte clearly teaches at least 2 phases of operations can be used to maximum protect the building structure (102) which is set up or programmed the system (100) if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ figs.2-3, ,5, col.5, line 53 to col.6, line 34, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 and abstract ].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ the system of La Bonte for monitoring and controlling the wildfire at all time near or close to the building structure.

Regarding claim 70, La Bonte discloses a method for detecting a presence of wildfire (106) by photoelectric detection, smoke (190), thermal (188) or infrared sensors (185,192) [figs.1-5, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and col.21, lines 34-65] comprising:

Art Unit: 2636

- at least 2 phases of operations can be used if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ fig.1, col.2, lines 44-57, col.3, lines 3-8, col.5, lines 18-29 and col.11, line 27 to col.12, line 9 and abstract ];

Although, the reference of La Bonte does not specifically mention detection wavelength is substantially blocked on propagation as claimed by the applicant.

However, the reference of La Bonte clearly teaches at least 2 phases of operations can be used to maximum protect the building structure (102) which is set up or programmed the system (100) if the presence of wildfire (106) is identified by the infrared sensors (185,188,190,192) [ figs.2-3, ,5, col.5, line 53 to col.6, line 34, col.20, lines 39-62 and col.21, lines 34-65 and abstract ].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the system of La Bonte for monitoring and controlling the wildfire at all time near or close to the building structure.

3. Claims 43-46, 48-53 & 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over La Bonte et al. (U.S. 5,931,233) in view of Document of Hamamatsu, Flame sensor UV TRON R2868 issued on 3, 1998.

Regarding claims 43-46, The reference of La Bonte does not specifically mention the detection wavelength between 230 and 280 nm as claimed by the applicant.

Application/Control Number: 10/792,048 Page 6

Art Unit: 2636

However, A document from Hamamatsu teaches a flame sensor as UV TRON R2868 which as a narrow spectral sensitivity of 185 to 260 nmm [fig.1, first page].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the teaching of Hamamatsu in the system of La Bonte for quickly flame or fire detection from remote distance and wide directivity as desired.

Regarding claims 48-53 & 68-69, The reference of La Bonte does not specifically mention the detection wavelength between 230 and 280 nm as claimed by the applicant.

However, A document from Hamamatsu teaches a flame sensor as UV TRON R2868 which as a narrow spectral sensitivity of 185 to 260 nmm [fig.1, first page]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of Hamamatsu in the system of La Bonte for quickly flame or fire detection from remote distance and wide directivity as desired.

## Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 54-67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2636

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Traina (U.S. 4,016,424) Ultraviolet radiation detector.

- Wyatt (U.S. 4,251,810) Apparatus for and methods of remotely monitoring

Page 7

outputs of Geiger-Mueller tubes.

Rogers et al. (U.S. 6,742,305) Fire protection cover apparatus for structures.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hung T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

2982. The examiner can normally he reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 am to

5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hofsass, Jeffery can be reached on (571) 272-2981. The fax phone number

for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 305-4700.

HUNG NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner: Hung

Date:

Oct. 17, 2005